



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/980,154	02/25/2002	Luigi Bruso	SCP-110	1188
7590		03/24/2004	EXAMINER	
Carlo Cioni		POPOVICS, ROBERT J		
Studio Cioni & Pipparelli		ART UNIT		
Viale Caldara 38		PAPER NUMBER		
Milano, I 20122		1724		
ITALY		DATE MAILED: 03/24/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/980,154

Applicant(s)

BRUSO ET AL.

Examiner

Robert J. Popovics

Art Unit

1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details. The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

The listing of references in the Search Report is not considered to be an information disclosure statement (IDS) complying with 37 CFR 1.98. 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2) requires a legible copy of: (1) each U.S. and foreign patent; (2) each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; (3) for each cited

pending U.S. application, the application specification including claims, and any drawing of the application, or that portion of the application which caused it to be listed including any claims directed to that portion; and (4) all other information, or that portion which caused it to be listed. In addition, each IDS must include a list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office (see 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1) and (b)), and MPEP § 609 subsection III. A(1) states, "the list ... must be submitted on a separate paper." Therefore, the references cited in the Search Report have not been considered. Applicant is advised that the date of submission of any item of information or any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the IDS, including all "statement" requirements of 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609 subsection III. C(1).

It is noted that all documents cited in the International Search Report are not of record.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The

Art Unit: 1724

recitation **"in a middle of the container,"** as recited in claim 1, is unsupported by the originally filed specification.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, the recitation **"the internal modifications"** appears to lack clear positive antecedent basis. At line 14, it is unclear which diaphragm is being referred to. Additionally, it is unclear what the specified first and second reduced heights are being compared with.

In claim 4, it is unclear what Applicant intends by the recitation **"an internal variation to the primary purifying unit."** If Applicant is attempting to change limitations already recited in claim 1, then, Applicant is not further limiting the base claim. Moreover, it is unclear which **"two elements"** are being referred to in claim 4.

In claim 5, it is unclear what Applicant intends by the recitation **"a lower diaphragm."** **"Lower,"** relative to what? Additionally, the recitation **"the flow control element"** appears to lack clear positive antecedent basis.

In claim 7, it is unclear what Applicant intends by the recitation **"Prefabricated Biological Duprator?"** (It is noted that page one of the originally filed specification refers to a **"Depurator."**) It is unclear how this claim further limits claim 1 from which it depends.

In claims 5, it is unclear what Applicant intends when using the term “complementary.”

In claim 8, “the upper element” appears to lack clear positive antecedent basis. Moreover, it is unclear what Applicant intends by “corresponding” in the context used.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: that the second unit “is filled with a grain size distribution ranging between 2 and 4 cm.”

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as based on a disclosure which is not enabling. That the second unit “is filled with a grain size distribution ranging between 2 and 4 cm” is critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure. See *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). Absent the specified media, the prefabricated biological purification system will be unable to accomplish the stated purification functions.

Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a “Prefabricated Biological Depurator,” it does not reasonably provide enablement for primary purification units other than the one specifically disclosed. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to modify primary purification units other than the unit

Art Unit: 1724

specifically disclosed, i.e., practice the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. In claim 7, Applicant specifies the primary purification unit to be a "Prefabricated Biological Depurator." Under the doctrine of claim differentiation, claim 1 cannot have the same scope as claim 7; i.e., claim 7 must further limit claim 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Robert J. Popovics at telephone number (571) 272-1164.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'R. Popovics', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Robert James Popovics
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1724

March 8, 2004